UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 10/002,491 | 11/15/2001 | Brett P. Monia | RTS-0239 | 2236 |

7590 12/15/2003

Jane Massey Licata or Kathleen A. Tyrrell
Licata & Tyrrell, P.C.
66 East Main Street
Marlton, NJ 08053

| EXAMINER | |
|---|---|
| MCGARRY, SEAN | |

| ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
|---|---|
| 1635 | |

DATE MAILED: 12/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

| Office Action Summary | Application No. | Applicant(s) | |
|---|---|---|---|
| | 10/002,491 | MONIA ET AL. | |
| | Examiner | Art Unit | |
| | Sean R McGarry | 1635 | |

*-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --*

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *03 October 2003*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

4)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1,2 and 4-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120**

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

**Attachment(s)**

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

## DETAILED ACTION

Applicants response to the Notice of Non-responsive Amendment, filed 10/03/03, has been considered. Applicant argues that since the restrictable inventions of claim 3 have been canceled the restriction is moot. Applicants arguments are considered convincing so long as the there is no reintroduction of the restricted inventions. If applicant, through the course of prosecution, amends the claims to contain those restrictable embodiments applicant will be required to make an election.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation

under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 1, 2, 4-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Forman et al [US 2002/0132223 A1] in view of Bennett et al [5,998,148] and Baracchini et al [5,801,154].

Forman et al have taught the association of FXR expression and cardiovascular disease and disclose the importance of inhibiting the activity of expression of FXR. It is disclosed throughout the specification methods of screening for inhibitors and specifically disclose the use of antisense or ribozymes to inhibit the activity of FXR at column 11 paragraph 0108. Forman et al do not specifically disclose antisense within the range of 8 to 50 nucleobases, modification of internucleoside linkages such as phosphorothioate, modification of sugar moieties such as 2'-o-methoxyethyl, modification of nucleobases such as 5-methylcytosine, "chimeric" antisense oligonucleotides, targeting an "active site", or compositions that comprise an FXR antisense with a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier such as a colloidal dispersion system. However, the following references clearly show that these limitations were routinely used in the prior art for optimization of antisense applications.

Bennett et al have taught general targeting guidelines at columns 3-4, for example. It has been taught to target 5'untranslated regions, start codons, coding regions, and 3'untranslated regions of a desired target, for example. It has been taught

in column 5, for example, that antisense compounds are commonly used as research reagents and diagnostics, for example. At column 5 it has been taught that antisense oligonucleotides 8-30 nucleotides in length are particularly preferred. At columns 6-7 it has been taught preferred antisense oligonucleotides contain modified internucleoside linkages including phosphorothioate linkages, for example. At columns 7-8 it has been taught that preferred antisense oligonucleotides comprise modified sugar moieties including2'-O-methoxyethyl. It has also been taught to modify nucleobases in antisense oligonucleotides at column 8-9 which includes the teaching of 5-methyl cytosine and at column 10 it has been taught chimeric antisense oligonucleotides. All of the above referred to modification are known in the art to provide beneficial attributes to antisense oligonucleotides such as increased hybridization and nuclease protection, for example. At columns 10-24, for example it has been taught numerous "carriers" for antisense oligonucleotides. In table I it has been taught the successful targeting of those regions taught in columns 3-4 with chimeric phosphorothioate oligonucleotides having 2'-MOE (a 2'-O-methoxyethyl modification).

Baracchini et al have taught, at column 6 for example, that antisense oligonucleotides can be used for research purposes and have also taught at column 6 that antisense oligonucleotides can be modified in their sugars, backbone linkages and nucleobases and that such modifications are desirable in antisense since these modifications have desirable properties such as, for example, enhanced cellular uptake, enhanced affinity for nucleic acid targets and increases stability in the presence of nucleases. Baracchini et al provide specific examples of such modifications at columns

6-8 and in Example 1, for example. These specific examples taught by Baracchini et al include phosphorothioate linkages, 2'-O-methoxyethyl sugars, 5-methylcytosine and chimeric oligonucleotides, for example. Tables 1-4 show the successful design and use of modified oligonucleotides in cells in culture, for example. Table I therefore reflects the successful practice of general antisense design taught at columns 8-10, for example. At column 4 it has been taught various carriers for antisense delivery. It has been taught at column 8 that antisense are preferably 8 to 30 nucleotides and that it is more preferable to make antisense oligonucleotides that are 12 to 25 nucleotides in length, for example.

The prior art has therefore made the claimed invention obvious. The prior art has clearly disclosed to inhibit FXR via antisense or ribozymes and has also taught all of the limitations recited in the instant claims and has also show that by following general teachings one in the art can expect to find an antisense that will inhibit a target in cells in culture, for example. The limitation "active site" is an empirically found target site where an antisense will be active in inhibiting a target and once one in the art selects an antisense as taught by the prior art they have also found an active site since an active antisense by virtue of its activity binds an "active site", for example.

The invention as a whole would therefore have been *prima facie* obvious to one in the art at the time the invention was made.

Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to

which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

The claimed invention is drawn to the therapeutic application of antisense oligonucleotides in an in vivo (whole animal) environment. The claims are drawn to treating or preventing diseases or conditions that may be associated with FXR expression.

The specification provides general guidance for the use of antisense in methods of treatment, but provides not specific guidance for the treatment or prevention any particular disease that may be associated with FXR expression. The specification provides examples of the inhibition of FXR in cells in culture, but provides no guidance how the inhibition in these cell types would correlate to the treatment or prevention of any particular disease, for example. The examples do not show what, if any phenotypes were associated with the inhibition of FXR, but only shows that FXR was in fact inhibited in cell types that may of may not be related to a disease of condition associated with FXR expression, for example. One in the art would not know, for example how the inhibition of FXR in carcinoma cells would correlate to the prevention of a cardiovascular disease, for example. The specification fails to provide guidance, with any particularity, how one would provide sufficient antisense oligonucleotides to particular cells that may associated with a disease associated with expression of FXR such that a specific disease would be prevented or treated, for example. The art of antisense therapy is an unpredictable art that has general obstacles that must be overcome before the treatment of disease with them would be routine. The state of the

art requires that sopecific guidance on effective delivery is provided for any particular treatment, for example. The instant specification fails to provide such guidance or examples that would correlate to such treatment or prevention. Branch [TIBS Vol. 23, February 1998] addresses the unpredictability and the problems faced in the antisense art with the following statements: "[a]ntisense molecules and ribozymes capture the imagination with their promise or rational drug design and exquisite specificity. [h]owever, they are far more difficult to produce than was originally anticipated, and their ability to eliminate the function of a single gene has never been proven."; "[t]o minimize unwanted non-antisense effects, investigators are searching for antisense compounds and ribozymes whose targets sites are particularly vulnerable to attack. [t]his is a challenging quest."; "[h]owever, their unpredictability confounds research applications of nucleic acid reagents."; "[n]on-antisense effects are not the only impediments to rational antisense drug design. [t]he internal structures of target RNAs and their associations with cellular proteins create physical barriers, which render most potential binding sites inaccessible to antisense molecules."; "Years of investigation can be required to figure out what an 'antisense' molecule is actually doing,. . ."; "Because knowledge of their underlying mechanism is typically acting, non-antisense effects muddy the waters."; "because biologically active compounds generally have a variety of effects, dose-response curves are always needed to establish a compounds primary pharmacological identity. [a]ntisense compounds are no exception. [a]s is true of all pharmaceuticals, the value of a potential antisense drug can only be judged after its intended clinical use is known, and quantitative information about its dose-response curve and therapeutic

index is known."; [c]ompared to the dose response curves of conventional drugs, which typically span two to three orders of magnitude, those of antisense drugs, extend only across a narrow concentration range."; "[b]ecause it is very difficult to predict what portions of an RNA molecule will be accessible *in vivo*, effective antisense molecules must be determined empirically by screening large number of candidates for their ability to act inside cells."; "[b]inding is the rare exception rather than the rule, and antisense molecules are excluded from most complementary sites. [s]ince accessibility cannot be predicted, rational design of antisense molecules is not possible."; and, "[t]he relationship between accessibility to ODN binding and vulnerability to ODN-mediated antisense inhibition *in vivo* is beginning to be explored. . . [i]t is not yet clear whether *in vitro* screening techniques. . . will identify ODNs that are effective *in vivo*."

Jen et al [STEM CELLS Vol. 18:307-319, 2000] discuss antisense based therapy and the challenges that remain before the use of antisense becomes routine in a therapeutic setting. Jen et al discuss the advances made in the art but also indicate that progress needs to be made in the art. In the conclusion of their review Jen et al assert "[g]iven the state of the art, it is perhaps not surprising that effective and efficient clinical translation of the antisense strategy has remained elusive." It is also stated "[t]he key challenges to this field have been outlined above. [I]t is clear that they will have to be solved if this approach to specific antitumor therapy is to become a useful treatment approach. [a] large number of diverse and talented groups are working on this problem, and we can all hope that their efforts will help lead to establishment of this promising form of therapy." It is clear from Jen et al that the state of the art of antisense is

unpredictable and those highly skilled in the art are working towards making the art of antisense therapy more predictable but have many obstacles to overcome.

It is clear from the art cited above that the specification as filed fails to provide the specific guidance required for the treatment or prevention of a disease with antisense since the specification provides only general guidance and does not provide any particular guidance for any particular disease state as would be required by the unpredictable state of the art as evidenced by the references cited above.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Sean R McGarry whose telephone number is (703)305-7028. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th (6:00-4:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John LeGuyader can be reached on (703) 308-0447. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 308-4242.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

srm

SEAN McGARRY
PRIMARY EXAMINER
1635